

Place

- Raymond High School Media Center

Call to Order

- 7:00 p.m.

Members Present

- Jonathan Wood (Chair)
- Don Hedman (Vice Chair)
- Greg Bemis (Board of Selectmen Ex-officio)
- Harry McClard
- Gretchen Gott
- Carolyn Matthews

Members Absent

- Steve Wallerstein (Secretary)

Staff Present

- Ernest Cartier Creveling (Community Development Director)
- Robert Price (Assistant Planner)

Pledge of Allegiance

Approval of Minutes

Members Seated for Approval of Minutes: Jonathan Wood; Don Hedman; Greg Bemis; Gretchen Gott; Harry McClard; Carolyn Matthews.

MOTION: Mr. McClard made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hedman to approve the minutes of April 03, 2014 as amended. The motion carried with a vote of 5-0-1, with Mr. Wood abstaining.

MOTION: Mr. McClard made a motion, seconded by Ms. Matthews to officially attach the site walk notes dated April 06, 2014 and prepared by Ms. Matthews, to the Planning Board's official meeting minutes of April 03, 2014. The motion carried with a unanimous vote of 6-0-0.

Work Session - RSA 41:14-a recommendation to Board of Selectmen regarding possible sale of Town-owned properties (Map 9, Lots 17 & 21).

Members Seated for this Discussion: Jonathan Wood; Don Hedman; Greg Bemis; Gretchen Gott; Harry McClard; Carolyn Matthews.

Mr. Cartier Creveling noted that some members of the Conservation Commission and Planning Board walked the subject properties on April 13, adding that neither group had a quorum. He explained that the purpose of this discussion is to formulate an official recommendation to the Board of Selectmen regarding the potential sale of these parcels.

Ms. Matthews noted the following:

- There is a substantial wet area on lot 21.

- No surprise to her that the area was named a high-value conservation target.
- If the Town were to sell Lot 21, then an access easement should be required so access to Lot 21 is not lost.
- She feels neither parcel is suitable for agricultural or forestry uses.

Mr. McClard added:

- Lot 17 is rolling meadow with lots of small trees.
- There is abundant wildlife on these properties.
- Lot 21 should be placed into conservation as the Lot is in near pristine condition.

Ms. Gott asked what the advantage would be to selling one or both of the lots. Mr. McClard replied he personally views the advantage as being a way to generate income as the lots would be subject to taxation. He added he feels the disadvantage would be losing control of Lot 21. He clarified that he feels Lot 17 would be okay to sell. Ms. Matthews agreed that Lot 17 could probably be sold, but stressed that Lot 21 should be retained by the Town.

Mr. McClard stated Lot 17 has grown up too much for recreational purposes, but noted Lot 21 is being actively used for recreation. He noted that fishing and hiking activity was obvious, adding the Lot feels like a nature preserve.

Ms. Gott noted that the potential buyer has stated his intentions to keep and preserve the properties in their current condition, but noted the Planning Board cannot predict what will happen to those parcels in the future if they end up in someone else's ownership.

Mr. Hedman stated the potential buyer is looking to preserve the parcels, and has stated his intention to not timber them, adding that the potential buyer also stated he would be amenable to deed restrictions. Mr. Hedman added that this makes possible sale of the parcels compelling. Mr. Wood cautioned that it would only take a subdivision to re-write and remove such deed restrictions.

Mr. Cartier Creveling stated a deed would make the issue of a deed restriction private. Under Town ownership, a deed restriction would have to be monitored and action taken if the restriction is violated. He added the best form of control is ownership, noting that once ownership is lost, things become much more difficult.

Ms. Gott stated placing an access easement across Lot 17 would create an additional cost to the Town as it would require the installation of a passable path for access since a truly passable path does not really exist presently.

Ms. Gott asked if the sale of these parcels needs to put out to bid in the same manner as a project the Town is looking to complete. Mr. Bemis replied the requirements for sale of property are not the same as those for a project requiring the services of a contractor.

Ms. Matthews noted that Mr. French objects to the use of the lots by the public, adding that one of his stated goals is to prevent access to Lot 21 through his ownership. She noted the Planning Board is weighing its own goals versus those of Mr. French, not just to prevent the parcels from being harvested for timber.

POLL

Mr. Wood polled the Planning Board as follows: Does the Planning Board recommend the sale of Lot 17?

Mr. Hedman: Yes

Mr. McClard: Yes

Ms. Matthews: Yes

Ms. Gott: No, because she is not sure the process being used in consideration of the sale of these parcels is fair to everyone, because the land is not being offered for a general sale, just to one person.

Mr. Bemis: Abstain

Mr. Wood: No vote

POLL

Mr. Wood polled the Planning Board as follows: Does the Planning Board recommend the sale of Lot 17 with deed language that removes development rights, but allows access to Lot 21?

Mr. Hedman: Yes

Mr. McClard: Yes

Ms. Matthews: Yes

Ms. Gott: Yes

Mr. Bemis: Abstain

Mr. Wood: Yes

POLL

Mr. Wood polled the Planning Board as follows: Does the Planning Board recommend the sale of Lot 17 with deed language that removes development rights or with a conservation easement?

Mr. Hedman: Deed restriction

Mr. McClard: Deed restriction

Ms. Matthews: Deed restriction

Ms. Gott: Conservation easement

Mr. Bemis: Abstain

Mr. Wood: Conservation easement

POLL

Mr. Wood polled the Planning Board as follows: Does the Planning Board recommend the sale of Lot 21?

Mr. Hedman: No

Mr. McClard: No

Ms. Matthews: No

Ms. Gott: No

Mr. Bemis: Abstain

Mr. Wood: No

Mr. Hedman noted if the Town were to sell Lot 21 and retain Lot 17, but not have the benefit of an easement, access to Lot 21 will not exist and therefore be landlocked. Mr. Wood clarified that Lot 17 would have to be sold with access to Lot 21 to make the sale legal, or the sale could not occur.

Mr. Cartier Creveling summarized the Planning Board's recommendation to the Board of Selectmen as follows:

- 1) Lot 17 should only be sold with deed restrictions put in place to remove development rights and also with an access easement benefitting Lot 21.
- 2) Lot 21 should not be sold as the lot is in near pristine environmental condition, is a sensitive and valuable wildlife habitat and should be strongly considered as a candidate for conservation.

Other Business – Staff Update, Board Reports & Other Discussions

Members Seated for this Discussion: Jonathan Wood; Don Hedman; Greg Bemis; Gretchen Gott; Harry McClard; Carolyn Matthews.

CHARRETTE

Mr. Cartier Creveling noted the following about the upcoming Planning Charrette on May 10:

- Being held May 10 from 9:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.
- Held at new Regional Economic Development Center building; 57 Main Street
- Beta Group (consultant) will be in Town before the Charrette to walk around with staff to prepare, take pictures, etc.
- Charrette will take in comments from people, consultant will take notes and draw sketches based on what they hear.
- There will be a walking tour and small work groups.
- Final presentation to the Board of Selectmen will be made sometime afterward.
- The Board of Selectmen endorsed the Charrette with a unanimous vote, as did the Raymond Business & Economic Development Council.
- Proposing that the Charrette be paid for with Master Plan CIP funds and results adopted as part of the Master Plan afterward.

Ms. Gott asked if this project was put out to bid. Mr. Cartier Creveling replied no, but noted that the Planning Board went out to bid in 2009 for something similar and received estimates of \$12,000-\$18,000. He also added that he has personally worked with the Beta Group before and endorses their work.

Ms. Gott asked if there was a way to include the public in the process as opposed to just inviting all board and committee members adding that she feels this event could be a way to drive up interest and volunteerism. Mr. Cartier Creveling replied that the intent is not to limit the Charrette to board and committee members, but rather to get all the leaders of the community to be involved. He added that his target audience is the board and committee members because he sees this as an opportunity to get everyone thinking along the same lines as one another in pursuit of a common goal, but the public is welcome to attend.

Mr. Hedman is concerned that the REDC building will not be large enough if the event is well attended, adding that he agrees others need to be involved aside from just board and committee members.

Ms. Matthews stated she feels the board and committee members need to experience the process firsthand because once they do, they will be excited and create momentum. Then, the public can be brought in with a greater sense of excitement.

Mr. Wood stated once there is a physical result that can be discussed, described, defended, etc., the Planning Board can hold a public meeting and do just that.

Ms. Gott asked how interest was generated for the Master Plan visioning process. Mr. Wood replied a lot of money was spent on a group that came in for a multi-staged process. He added there was also a lot of outreach from staff and Board members that took place.

Ms. Gott stated the lack of parking availability at the REDC building is a concern for her. Mr. Cartier Creveling stated people can very easily park on Wight Street and walk to the building. He added the building lends itself very well to this type of project and the types of work that will be done. Ms. Gott stated it is not just the lack of parking availability at the REDC building that concerns her, but the fact that the lack of parking availability located downtown as a whole could have an adverse effect on the nearby businesses during the Charrette.

MOTION: Mr. McClard made a motion, seconded by Ms. Matthews to direct Mr. Cartier Creveling to proceed with the Planning Charrette as proposed. The motion carried with a vote of 5-1-1, with Mr. Bemis abstaining and Ms. Gott opposed due to the location, the lack of a formal bid process having occurred and the lack of pursuit of general public involvement.

IDENTIFY QUESTIONS FOR LEGAL COUNSEL

The Planning Board next developed a list of questions to ask their Legal Counsel in a non-meeting format. The list of questions generated will be forwarded to Counsel in advance of an upcoming non-meeting.

EXCAVATION SITE WALKS

The Planning Board agreed that site walks for the active excavation sites (owned by Waldoborough, LLC; Candia South Branch Brook, LLC & Hard Rock Development, LLC respectively) shall be held on Thursday May 22 starting at 6:00 p.m. The order shall be:

1. Candia South Branch Brook (approx. 6:00 – 6:30)
2. Waldoborough (approx. 6:30 – 7:15/7:30)
3. Hard Rock Development (approx.. 7:15/7:30 – as long as needed/darkness)

REGIONAL MEETING

Mr. Wood noted that the Planning Board had concerns about holding a regional meeting in the near future. After some discussion about the issue, the Board unanimously agreed to invite the planning boards from all towns abutting Raymond to a meeting on June 19.

OTHER GOALS FOR THE PLANNING BOARD

The Board noted the following items which they want to accomplish during the year:

1. Interview Southern NH Planning Commission, Rockingham Planning Commission and Strafford Regional Planning Commission to discuss services, perhaps perform a cost-benefit analysis, etc.
2. Send the Natural Resources chapter of the Master Plan to the Conservation Commission and have them review it to establish their own set of goals based upon the chapter.
3. Look into prime wetland designation and delineation
4. Focus attention on Stormwater Management Regulations, finalizing requirements of Raymond related to MS4, etc.
5. Work through some of the Master Plan's Goals, starting with a Village District Ordinance.

ZONING ORDINANCE

Mr. Cartier Creveling noted that he is working on reorganizing and reformatting the Zoning Ordinance to make it easier to use and follow. He asked if any members of the Planning Board wanted to volunteer to help with the process. Both Ms. Matthews and Mr. McClard volunteered.

Ms. Matthews suggested that the Planning Board consider a listening session with RBEDC, Code Enforcement Officer Richard Mailhot and others deemed pertinent to the discussion to hear their difficulties/concerns with the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Wood noted that he recently spoke with Laurel Bistany, Executive Director of REDC. She informed him that Rockingham County has a lot of people within it that have experience with MS4 and how it works. He added that Ms. Bistany informed him she has worked extensively with Rockingham Planning Commission and feels they are very competent. He stated his preference would be to speak with Rockingham Planning Commission first when RPCs are brought before the Board.

Work Session: Model Energy Ordinance & Model Small Wind Energy Systems Ordinance

Members Seated for this Discussion: Jonathan Wood; Don Hedman; Greg Bemis; Gretchen Gott; Harry McClard; Carolyn Matthews.

Mr. Cartier Creveling noted the model ordinances for Energy and Small Wind Energy systems are cumbersome. He noted the Town of Epping has adopted their own versions of each that might make more sense for the Board to use as starting points. The Board requested that Epping's Ordinances be distributed for their review in the future.

Other Business – Staff Update, Board Reports & Other Discussions – Part II

Members Seated for this Discussion: Jonathan Wood; Don Hedman; Greg Bemis; Gretchen Gott; Harry McClard; Carolyn Matthews.

IN-LAW APARTMENTS

Mr. Wood noted that the Town of Raymond does not define in-law apartments, choosing instead to focus on two-family dwellings due to complications with enforcement. He noted the Town of Salem defines in-law apartments in a manner which might be effective and added he would like the Board to consider allowing in-law apartments as opposed to strictly two-family dwellings.

MASTER PLAN GOALS & OBJECTIVES

The Board requested that the list of goals, objectives and implementation strategies be revised so like-items are merged to make it more manageable.

Mr. Hedman requested that each of the Recommended Action IDs be spelled out fully rather than through abbreviation, and requested that the Board's 2014 goals and objectives be mapped to the Master Plan list.

Ms. Matthews noted the Statute advises that the Master Plan be re-done every ten years. She asked if the Board can get credit for the work that has been done over the last year. Mr. Cartier Creveling replied he would check into that.

The Planning Board heard reports from its members serving on other boards and committees.

Adjournment

MOTION: Mr. McClard made a motion, seconded by Ms. Matthews to adjourn. The motion carried with a unanimous vote of 6-0-0. The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Price
Assistant Planner